

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Applicant: Hershkovich et al.

Serial No.: 10/690,556

Filed: October 23, 2003

For: Search Method Using Coded Keys

Examiner: Jean B. Fleurantin

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Group Art Unit: 2162

Attorney

Docket: 2694/24

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313FAX NO. 571-273-4035INFORMAL

Examiner Fleurantin:

Further to our conversation, I have written out -- in brief -- some of the main issues for discussion (see page 2). After discussing these issues, we would also like to explore with you some subject matter for additional claims.

Looking forward to speaking with you Wednesday morning, 11 April, at 9AM EST.

Yours,

Mark M. Friedman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,883

Date: April 10, 2007

S/N: 10/690,556

2

Art Unit: 2162

10-Apr-07

Atty. Dkt.:2694/24

### ISSUES

1. Does Fuh teach a "pre-determined search", as recited by claim 1? Is a pre-determined search inherently possible when the art of Fuh is used to modify the method of Stark '7446 [Application Publication No. 2002/0007446].

A "pre-determined search" is defined in the instant Specification [page 54] as follows:

As used herein in the specification and in the claims section that follows, the term "pre-determined search" refers to a search within a node (in the case of a search tree structure) or a list, in which the amount of data required to perform the search is pre-determined, i.e., can be calculated in advance.

2. Stark '7446 teaches searching key entries; Stark '7446 does not teach the use of coded entries, and therefore, clearly does not have "processing logic for searching coded entries". Please note that the term "coded entries" is clearly defined in the instant Specification:

As used herein in the specification and in the claims section that follows, the terms "coded key entry", "coded entry" and the like refer to a key entry resulting from a transformation of at least one ("original") key entry, wherein the coded entry is compact with respect to the at least one original key entry.

3. Are Stark '7446 and Fuh properly combinable?

Fuh claims transformation module "improves data integrity" [column 8, lines 36-40]; We respectfully request the Examiner to demonstrate how Fuh's transformation module would improve Stark's data integrity. Fuh's claim of improved data integrity may be relevant with respect to systems containing "user-defined data" [Fuh column 2, lines 20-25], but it would appear that Stark '7446 has no such problem, nor any problem of data integrity that Fuh's teachings can solve.

4. Regarding various dependent claims, such as claims 8, 11, and 13, the additional limitations were found to be unpatentable due to the teachings of Stark '7446. But those teachings relate to full key entries, and not to coded key entries (for discussion).

EXPLORING SUBJECT MATTER FOR POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

- for original keys of a given original key length, the coded key length is related to the original key length by a substantially constant compression factor  
see, inter alia, [0059] of 2005/0091443 to Hershkovich et al.
- coded key having a length substantially equal to  $\log_2$ [key entry length]  
see [0059] of '1443
- coded key having a length equal to closest integer larger than  $\log_2$ [key entry length]  
see [0065] of '1443
- each coded key is unique  
see [0058] of '1443